UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/821,109	03/29/2001	James I. Knutson	AUS920010194US1	3270

7590   10/24/2003

Frank C. Nicholas
CARDINAL LAW GROUP
Suite 2000
1603 Orrington Avenue
Evanston, IL 60201

EXAMINER
MOSLEHI, FARHOOD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	

DATE MAILED: 10/24/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 March 2001* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-21 are presented for examination.

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act

of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical

Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting

directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000.

Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior

to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3.   Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Bowman-Amuah (US 6,332,163) (hereinafter Bowman).

4.   As per claim 1, Bowman describes a method of interfacing to pre-existing

software code, comprising:

Providing a software wrapper capable of inheriting from at least a first application

program interface (API) and a second API (e.g. col. 219, lines 19-42);

Delegating to a pre-existing enumeration of objects for a call to the first API (e.g. col.

222, lines 20-40), The Legacy Wrapper Component and the Component Adapter

provides the same functionality of a function call to the first object via its API;

Creating a vector identifying elements of the enumeration (e.g. col. 206, lines 25-45);

Maintaining a positional cursor based on a call to the second API (e.g. col. 222, lines 1-

22);

Comparing the positional cursor to the vector; (e.g. col. 206, lines 5-60); and selectively

extracting one or more additional elements from the numeration based on the

comparison of the positional cursor and the vector (e.g. col. 206, lines 5-60).

5.   As per claim 8, it is rejected for the similar reasons as stated above.

6.   As per claim 15, it is rejected for the similar reasons as stated above.

7.   As per claim 2, Bowman describes the method wherein the first API is a java-

based enumeration API (e.g. col. 206, line 47).

8.   As per claim 10, it is rejected for the similar reason as stated above.

9.   As per claim 16, it is rejected for the similar reason as stated above.

10.   As per claim 17, it is rejected for the similar reason as stated above.

11.   As per claim 3, Bowman describes the method wherein the second API is a java-

based collection API (e.g. col. 206, line 29).

12.   As per claim 11, it is rejected for the similar reason as stated above.

13.   As per claim 18, it is rejected for the similar reason as stated above.

14.   As per claim 4, Bowman describes the method further comprising: providing an

iterator, associated with the second API, for maintaining the positional cursor (e.g. col.

206, lines 5-11).

15.   As per claim 5, it is rejected for the similar reason as stated above.

16.   As per claim 12, it is rejected for the similar reason as stated above.

17.   As per claim 13, it is rejected for the similar reason as stated above.

18.   As per claim 19, it is rejected for the similar reason as stated above.

19.   As per claim 20, it is rejected for the similar reasons as stated above.

20.   As per claim 6, Bowman describes a method further comprising:

Synchronizing a plurality of methods for extracting the elements from the enumeration

(e.g. col. 206, lines 51-58).

21.   As per claim 14, it is rejected for the similar reason as stated above.

22.   As per claim 21, it is rejected for the similar reasons as stated above.

23.   As per claim 7, Bowman describes a method wherein the step of selectively

extracting includes:

Extracting the elements from the enumeration when the positional cursor matches the

size of the vector (e.g. col. 206, lines 55-57).

24.   As per claim 9, Bowman shows the system further comprising software code for

defining the enumeration (e.g. col. 206, lines 47-49).

25.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

      US Patent Number US 6,305,007 to Mintz

      Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Farhood Moslehi whose telephone number is 703-305-

8646. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 703-305-8498. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-

5484.

fm

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100